

Appl. No. 09/736,925  
Amdt. dated September 23, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2003

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 and 18-26 are pending in this application.

Claims 9-17 have been cancelled and rewritten in independent form as new claims 18-26. In particular, independent claim 18 corresponds to original claim 9; independent claim 20 corresponds to original claim 11; independent claim 21 corresponds to original claim 12 and independent claim 23 corresponds to original claim 14. Insofar as the Examiner has objected to claims 9-17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but has indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, it is believed claims 18-26 are allowable.

Turning to the grounds for rejection, claims 1,2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 5,591, 309 or 5,593,545 to Rugowski et al. It is asserted that Rugowski et al. discloses a process without any open draws, including calendering between two rolls 22 and 26. However, independent claim 1 recites that the sheet is removed from the papermaking fabric, modified (such as by calendering), and thereafter transferred to a papermaking fabric that carries the sheet to the reel section for winding. Rugowski et al. does not teach or suggest transferring the calendered sheet to a papermaking fabric that carries the sheet to the reel section. Instead, the calendering step between rolls 22 and 26 of Rugowski et al. occurs at the reel. No papermaking fabric is involved after the calendering step. Consequently Rugowski et al. does not anticipate or render as obvious Applicants' claimed method.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rugowski et al. in view of U.S. 4,087,319 to Linkletter. Linkletter discloses embossing a creped web while being supported by a fabric prior to reeling. It is asserted that it would be obvious to substitute an embossing roll, as taught by Linkletter, for the calender roll of Rugowski et al. However, for the same reason discussed above with respect to the rejection based on Rugowski et al., there is no suggestion to remove the tissue sheet from the papermaking fabric in order to emboss it and then return the sheet to a papermaking fabric to carry the embossed sheet to the reel section. Applicants' claimed method provides greater flexibility than the method of Linkletter/Rugowski et al. because Applicants' embossing method is not limited to embossing while the sheet is supported by the fabric. This avoids fabric wear and the inherent embossing pattern limitation created by the presence of the fabric. Therefore claim 3 is not obvious from the teachings of Linkletter and Rugowski et al.

Appl. No. 09/736,925  
Amdt. dated September 23, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2003

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rugowski et al. in view of U.S. 5,601,871 to Krzysik et al. Krzysik et al. teaches that the properties of a tissue sheet can be improved by printing the surface of the sheet with certain compositions. It is asserted that it would be obvious to print a treatment composition onto the tissue web in Rugowski et al. prior to reeling. However, as with the grounds for rejection discussed above, such a combination does not suggest removing the sheet from the supporting fabric, printing the sheet, and then returning the sheet to a supporting fabric prior to reeling. Therefore claim 4 is not obvious from the combined teachings of Rugowski et al. and Krzysik et al.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rugowski et al. in view of U.S. 5,672,248 to Wendt et al. Wendt et al. teaches the use of a steel roll and a rubber-faced roll as a calender roll pair. It is asserted that it would be obvious to provide the calender roll pair of Rugowski et al. with steel and rubber. It is also asserted that the use of a fixed gap or loaded roll would also be obvious as taught by Wendt et al. However, as discussed above, there is no suggestion to remove the sheet from the fabric, calender the sheet and return the calendered sheet to a supporting fabric that carries the calendered sheet to the reel section. Therefore claims 6-8 are not obvious from the cited references.

It is believed that all of the claims in this application are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any prosecutorial fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (920) 721-3616.

Respectfully submitted,

J. L. BAGGOT ET AL.

By: 

Gregory E. Croft

Registration No.: 27,542

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Appl. No. 09/736,925  
Amdt. dated September 23, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 1, 2003

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I, Judy Garot, hereby certify that on September 23, 2003 this Amendment is being transmitted via facsimile phone no. (703) 872-9310 to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA.

By:

*Judy Garot*  
Judy Garot

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 24 2003

OFFICIAL